



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/571,748

03/14/2006

Micheal J. Petrillo

PHUS030359US

1212

38107

7590

09/18/2008

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
595 MINER ROAD  
CLEVELAND, OH 44143

EXAMINER

IGYARTO, CAROLYN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2884

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/18/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/571,748	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PETRILLO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CAROLYN IGYARTO	<b>Art Unit</b> 2884	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9, 11-14 and 16-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9, 11-14 and 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 November 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6 June 2008 has been entered. Accordingly, claims 2-3, 8-9, 11, 13, 16-18, and 21 have been amended. Claims 1, 10, and 15 have been cancelled. Claim 22 has been newly added. Thus, claims 2-9, 11-14, and 16-22 are currently pending in this application.
2. In view of the amended claims, received 30 April 2008, the previous objections made to the claims have been withdrawn.
3. In view of the amended claims, received 30 April 2008, the previous rejections to the claims made under 35 USC 112 have been withdrawn.
4. The Examiner thanks and acknowledges the annotated sheet of Figure 1, which was received 30 April 2008.

Art Unit: 2884

5. Claim 16 has been amended to recite “the holes of only one of the longer and shorter dimension being used.” This recitation appears to be unclear and to have two possible meanings. The first meaning that one hole in the shorter dimension and one hole in the longer dimension are used. The second meaning that only holes of the longer dimension or only holes of the shorter dimension are used. The Examiner is interpreting this recitation to have the second meaning, because this is the meaning that is supported by the original disclosure. If in fact this recitation is meant to have the first meaning this would become a new matter issue, because this meaning is not disclosed in the original disclosure.

6. Claim 22 raises some new matter concerns. Claim 22 recites "each detector element having a plurality of electrical connection pins that mate with the plurality of electrical connections in the substrate. The original disclosure discloses detector elements to be equivalent to pixels and multiple pixels are arrayed together and supported. It is original disclosed that this support has a plurality of connection pins not that each detector element has a plurality of pins. The Examiner is interpreting “a detector element” in the context of claim 22 to comprise pixels. If Applicant is intending to have "detector element" of this claim mean a single pixel, which does not comprise smaller pixels, this would raise new matter issues.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 30 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
8. Applicant argues that Lingren does not teach rigid pins aligning the detector array with the circuit board. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. [0041] and Figs. 2 and 3a of Lingren discloses rigid pins **240** aligning the detector array with the circuit board **203**.
9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-14, 16-17 and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lingren et al. (EP 1249713), hereinafter referred to as Lingren.
12. With respect to **claim 2**, Lingren teaches a detector for a nuclear imaging system ([0029] lines 3-4), the detector comprising:

Art Unit: 2884

a plurality of platforms (214; [0030] lines 1-2, Each module 206 includes a carrier 214 as seen in Fig. 3a.) which each support an array of individual detector elements (Fig. 3a), each platform including:

a plurality of electrical connectors ([0037] lines 1-2; [0041] lines 2-3), and

a platform alignment structure that includes rigid pins for aligning the platforms supporting the detector elements ([0041] lines 2-4; [0048] lines 2-3; [0051] lines 1-2) with a circuit board (208) that receives the platforms ([0030] lines 1-3),

which circuit board includes:

a plurality of electrical connection means that electrically connect with the electrical connectors ([0029] lines 5-6; [0037] lines 1-2; [0041] lines 2-4), and

a mating circuit board alignment structure that includes apertures of like-cross-section with the platform alignment structure rigid pins that mate with the platform alignment structure rigid pins to align the platform and the individual detector elements to the circuit board ([0041] lines 2-4; [0048] lines 2-3; [0051] lines 1-2); and

a means for mounting a collimator to the circuit board in alignment with the circuit board ([0027] lines 3-4; Fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2884

13. With respect to **claim 8**, Lingren teaches the platform alignment structures include rigid pins positioned diagonally from each other (Fig. 3a).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lingren et al. (EP 1249713), hereinafter referred to as Lingren, as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Orava et al. (US 5,955,733), hereinafter referred to as Orava.

16. With respect to **claim 3**, Lingren teaches all of the limitations of claim 2, as explained above. Lingren further teaches pins having separate functions ([0049] lines 1-2; [0051]; [0052]; Tables 1-2). If it is held that Lingren does not teach any of the pins are not used for transmitting electrical signals between the platforms and the circuit board; Then, Orava teaches the use of pins that are solely used for alignment purposes and are not used for transmitting electrical signals between the platform and the circuit board (col. 5, lines 41-51), for the benefit of increasing stability. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have some of

Art Unit: 2884

the pins taught by Lingren be used solely for alignment purposes and not used for transmitting electrical signals between the platforms and the circuit for the benefit of increasing stability.

17. With respect to **claim 9**, Lingren teaches the connectors are pins of relatively soft metal that tend to deform as the platform are received on the circuit board (soldered [0049] lines 1-2).

18. Claims 4-6 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Lingren et al. (EP 1249713), hereinafter referred to as Lingren or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious.

19. With respect to **claim 4**, Lingren teaches, the collimator mounting means includes a frame ([0033] lines 1-2) and further including: an aligning means for aligning the frame and the circuit board ([0033] lines 1-2) and the collimator is mounted in a fixed alignment (Fig. 2). In the alternative, if it is held that Lingren does not teach the housing to surround the collimator (or the mounting means includes a frame) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have the housing surround the collimator on the sides for the benefit of preventing stray radiation from adversely affecting the acquired image ([0032] line 3).



Art Unit: 2884

20. With respect to **claim 5**, Lingren teaches the individual detector elements are separated by interfaces or gaps (lines of separation 216; Fig. 3a) and wherein the collimator includes mechanical elements which define a plurality of apertures ([0027] line 4; collimators include a plurality of apertures, especially when an imaging device having a plurality of pixels is receiving the energy that is passing through the apertures), the mechanical elements being aligned with the interfaces or gaps such that the apertures are centered on and aligned with the individual detector elements (inherently, the collimator apertures and pixel centers are aligned providing the system with improved resolution). In the alternative, if it is held that Lingren does not inherently teach the collimator having a plurality of apertures or the apertures of the collimator being aligned with the center of the pixels; It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include a plurality of apertures in the collimator for the benefit of broadening the area being imaged at any given time. Also, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to align the apertures of the collimator with the center of the pixels for the benefit of increasing the resolution of the system.

21. With respect to **claim 6**, Lingren further teaches the aligning means includes: at least two alignment holes defined in the frame, and at least two matching holes defined in the circuit board ([0033] lines 1-2).

Art Unit: 2884

22. With respect to **claim 18**, Lingren teaches a detector for a nuclear imaging system ([0029] lines 3-4), the detector comprising:

a plurality of detector elements (detector elements 212) selectively securable to a circuit board ([0049] lines 4-6), the detector elements being separated by gaps (lines of separation 216);

rigid pins that align the detector elements on the circuit board (Figs. 2 and 3a; [0041]);

a collimator comprising mechanical elements which define a plurality of apertures ([0027] line 4); and

a collimator alignment mechanism, said collimator alignment mechanism aligning the mechanical elements with the gaps separating the detector elements such that the apertures are aligned with the detector elements (Fig. 2).

In the alternative, if it is held that Lingren does not inherently teach the collimator having a plurality of apertures or the apertures of the collimator being aligned with the center of the pixels; It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include a plurality of apertures in the collimator for the benefit of broadening the area being imaged at any given time. Also, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to align the apertures of the collimator with the center of the pixels for the benefit of increasing the resolution of the system.

Art Unit: 2884

23. With respect to **claim 19**, Lingren further teaches a detector element alignment mechanism, said detector element alignment mechanism aligning the detector elements on the circuit board ([0041] lines 2-4).

24. With respect to **claim 20**, Lingren teaches each aperture is aligned with an individual detector element ([0027] line 4). In the alternative, if it is held that Lingren does not inherently teach each aperture is aligned with an individual detector element; it is well known in the art to have each aperture of a collimator correspond and be position with individual detector elements, for the benefit of increasing resolution. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have each aperture of the collimator taught by Lingren to be aligned with an individual detector element for the benefit of increasing resolution.

25. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lingren et al. (EP 1249713), hereinafter referred to as Lingren, as applied to claims 2, 4, and 6 above, and further in view of Chu et al. (US 2004/0080952), hereinafter referred to as Chu.

26. With respect to **claim 7**, Lingren teaches all of the limitations of claims 1 and 4-5 or in the alternative all of the limitations of claims 4-5 are taught or made obvious, as explained above. Lingren further teaches the detection modules arranged in a rectangular array ([0048] lines 4-5 and 11).

Lingren does not explicitly teach the frame has a rectangular face including: a longer dimension, and a shorter dimension, the at least two frame alignment holes being disposed along the shorter dimension to reduce an effect of thermal dilatation.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have the housing, or frame, have similar dimensions to the array of detection modules for the benefit of decreasing wasted space and making the system more compact.

Chu teaches having two alignment structures of a frame disposed along the shorter dimension for the benefit of decreasing the difficulty in disassembling the frame ([0007] lines 7-8; [0009] lines 6, 9, and 15-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have the at least two frame alignment holes disposed along the shorter dimension in the invention of Lingren for the benefit of decreasing the difficulty in disassembling the frame.

27. Claims 11-12 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lingren and in view of Anderton, R. Larry (US 2003/0095627), hereinafter referred to as Anderton, and Appleby et al. (US 2003/0235272), hereinafter referred to as Appleby.

28. With respect to **claims 11 and 22**, Lingren teaches a method of assembling a detector for a nuclear imaging system and a detector assembly ([0029] lines 3-4) comprising:

inserting each of a plurality of platforms (214; [0030] lines 1-2, Each module 206 includes a carrier 214 as seen in Fig. 3a.), which each include an array of individual detector elements (Fig. 3a), a plurality of electrical connectors ([0037] lines 1-2; [0041] lines 2-3), and a first set of rigid alignment pins ([0041] lines 2-4) into a circuit board (208; [0030] lines 1-3) which includes a plurality of electrical connections which electrically connect with the electrical connectors as the platforms are inserted ([0029] lines 5-6; [0037] lines 1-2; [0041] lines 2-4), and circuit board alignment structures, which mate with the first set of rigid alignment pins as the platform is inserted to align the arrays of detector elements with the circuit board and each other ([0041] lines 2-4);

Lingren further teaches a means for mounting a collimator to the circuit board in alignment with the circuit board ([0027] lines 3-4; Fig. 2). Lingren, also, teaches including a frame as a housing ([0033] lines 1-2) and an aligning means for aligning the frame and the circuit board ([0033] lines 1-2) and the collimator is mounted in a fixed alignment (Fig. 2). if it is held that Lingren does not teach the housing to surround the collimator (or the mounting means includes a frame) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have the housing surround the collimator on the sides for the benefit of preventing stray radiation from adversely affecting the acquired image ([0032] line 3).

Lingren does not explicitly teach the frame (or housing) to be a collimator mounting frame, which frame mounts the collimator in fixed alignment.

However, it is known in the art, to include a mounting frame around the collimator for the benefit of increasing support and control in aligning the collimator, as shown in paragraph [0042] of Anderton.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a mounting frame, as known in the art and taught by Anderton, frame mounting the collimator, taught by Lingren, for the benefit of increasing support and control in aligning the collimator.

Lingren does not teach using a second set of rigid alignment pins as the means for mounting a collimator to the circuit board in alignment with the circuit board. Appleby teaches using pins to align a collimator [0372]. Also, it is known in the alignment art to use rigid pins to align different objects to each other. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a second set of rigid pins (as is known in the art and taught by Appleby) as the means for mounting a collimator to the circuit board in alignment with the circuit board, as taught by Lingren, as a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his/her technical grasp.

29. With respect to **claim 12**, Lingren teaches the individual detector elements are separated by interfaces or gaps (lines of separation 216; Fig. 3a) and wherein the collimator includes mechanical elements which define a plurality of apertures ([0027] line 4; collimators include a plurality of apertures, especially when an imaging device having a plurality of pixels is receiving the energy that is passing through the apertures),

Art Unit: 2884

the mechanical elements being aligned with the interfaces or gaps such that the apertures are centered on and aligned with the individual detector elements (inherently, the collimator apertures and pixel centers are aligned providing the system with improved resolution). If it is held that Lingren does not inherently teach the collimator having a plurality of apertures or the apertures of the collimator being aligned with the center of the pixels; It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include a plurality of apertures in the collimator for the benefit of broadening the area being imaged at any given time. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to align the apertures of the collimator with the center of the pixels for the benefit of increasing the resolution of the system.

30. With respect to **claim 21**, Anderton is silent on how the frame is secured to the collimator. However, it is very well known in the art to secure something into a frame using alignment pins corresponding to alignment holes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the collimator in the frame, as taught by Anderton, including inserting collimator alignment pins into corresponding alignment holes in the frame, as is known in the art, as a person with ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his/her technical grasp.

Art Unit: 2884

31. Claims 13-14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orava et al. (US 5,955,733), hereinafter referred to as Orava, and further in view of Lingren et al. (EP 1249713), hereinafter referred to as Lingren.

32. With respect to **Claim 13**, Orava teaches a detector for a nuclear imaging system (col. 1, lines 9-10 and 16-17), the detector comprising:

a substrate including a plurality of sets of electrically conductive holes (col. 5, lines 19-23) and alignment holes of a first cross section (col. 5, lines 40-42); and

a plurality of detector modules (col. 4, lines 28-32) each detector module including a plurality of electrically conductive connection pins (col. 5, lines 16-23 and 46-47; col. 6, lines 65-67) and rigid alignment pins of the first cross section (col. 5, lines 40-43), each set of alignment holes **5b** being configured to receive the alignment pins **5a** of one of the modules (col. 5, lines 16-23 and 40-43), the electrically conductive pins being softer than the alignment pins and easier to bend than the alignment pins, such that the alignment pins maintain the detector modules in alignment with each other and the circuit board even when the electrically conductive connection pins bend during receipt into the electric connection pin receiving holes (col. 5, lines 16-23 and 40-47; col. 6, lines 65-67).

In the alternative, if it is held that Orava does not inherently teach the electrically conductive connection pins to be softer than the alignment pins and easier to bend than



Art Unit: 2884

the alignment pins. Orava teaches using a flexible material for the benefit of ensuring that the air pressure differential between the upper and lower surfaces of the device is maintained (col. 5, lines 36-40). Therefore It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have the electrically conductive connection pins made of a material that is sufficiently soft that tends to bend for the benefit of ensuring that the air pressure differential between the upper and lower surfaces of the device is maintained.

If it is held that Orava does not include a frame or alignment holes attaching the frame to the substrate. Lingren teaches the substrate defines a plurality of substrate alignment holes and further including: a frame which defines alignment holes, which align with the substrate alignment holes for the benefit of preventing stray radiation from affecting the acquired image ([0032] line 3; [0033] lines 1-2). Also, it is known in the art to use holes to align two objects together. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a frame aligned to substrate including alignment holes of the frame and substrate, for the benefit of preventing stray radiation from affecting the acquired image and as a person with ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his/her technical grasp.

Orava does not explicitly teach a collimator having rigid alignment pins for mounting collimator in precise alignment with the frame, which has alignment holes, transitively aligning the collimator with the substrate and detector modules. Lingren teaches using an aligned collimator with respect of a frame and detector elements for

Art Unit: 2884

the benefit of increasing resolution ([0027] line 4; Fig. 2). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include a collimator, as taught by Lingren, in the invention taught by Orava, for the benefit of increasing resolution.

If it is held that Lingren, as modified above, does not teach the housing to surround the collimator (or the frame includes a collimator mounting means) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have the housing surround the collimator on the sides for the benefit of preventing stray radiation from adversely affecting the acquired image ([0032] line 3).

It is known in the alignment art to use rigid pins and holes as the means of alignment between two objects. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made use rigid pins and holes as the alignment means between the collimator and frame, as a person with ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his/her technical grasp.

33. With respect to **claim 14**, Orava further teaches each detector module includes: individual detector elements which are electrically connected to the electrically conductive connector pins, the individual detector elements being mounted in a rectangular array separated from each other by a rectangular grid of interfaces (col. 4, lines 55-61; col. 5, lines 15-23; Orava teaches that in a preferred embodiment Active Semiconductor Imaging Devices as described in PCT/EP95/02056 are used. As seen

Art Unit: 2884

in Fig. 5 of PCT/EP95/02056 the individual detector elements are configured in a rectangular array including rectangular grid interfaces.).

34. With respect to **claim 17**, Orava does not teach the collimator including: radiation blocking element that form a rectangular grid which overlays the interface grids of the individual detector elements which are mounted to the substrate when the collimator is mounted in and aligned with the frame that is aligned with the substrate.

If it is held that Lingren does not inherently teach the collimator having a plurality of elements or the apertures of the collimator being aligned with the center of the pixels; It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include a plurality of apertures in the collimator for the benefit of broadening the area being imaged at any given time. Also, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to align the apertures of the collimator with the center of the pixels for the benefit of increasing the resolution of the system.

35. **Claim 16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orava et al. (US 5,955,733), hereinafter referred to as Orava, in view of Lingren et al. (EP 1249713), hereinafter referred to as Lingren, as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Chu et al. (US 2004/0080952), hereinafter referred to as Chu.

Orava further teaches the substrate to be in a rectangular configuration (Fig. 3).

Orava does not explicitly teach the frame has a rectangular face which includes: a longer dimension, and a shorter dimension; and the alignment holes including two

Art Unit: 2884

alignment holes defined in the shorter dimension and two alignment holes in the longer dimension, the holes of only one of the longer and shorter dimensions being used to reduce an effect of thermal dilatation.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have the housing, or frame, have similar dimensions to the array of detection modules for the benefit of decreasing wasted space and making the system more compact.

Chu teaches having two alignment structures of a frame disposed along the shorter dimension for the benefit of decreasing the difficulty in disassembling the frame ([0007] lines 7-8; [0009] lines 6, 9, and 15-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have the at least two frame alignment holes disposed along the shorter dimension in the invention of Lingren for the benefit of decreasing the difficulty in disassembling the frame.

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that Chu teaches using an alignment structure along only one direction of a frame would decrease difficulty in disassembling the frame, because the frame would then be fastened in fewer places. Orava, as modified above, does not explicitly teach having a second set of alignment holes and these holes being located in the longer dimension. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have two alignment holes in the longer dimension, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art and since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis*

Art Unit: 2884

Co., 549 f.2d 833, 193 USPQ 8 (1976). Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CAROLYN IGYARTO whose telephone number is (571)270-1286. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:30 A.M. to 5 P.M. E.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CI

Application/Control Number: 10/571,748  
Art Unit: 2884

Page 21

/CHRISTINE SUNG/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2884